MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS

#:5299

Filed 02/16/24 Page 1 of 6 Page ID

Case 2:18-cv-06081-JAK-SK Document 343-4

28

I, Mark Rosenbaum, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney, duly licensed to practice law in the State of California, and am admitted before this Court. I am a Senior Special Counsel with Public Counsel ("Public Counsel") and lead counsel for Plaintiffs in this action. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this declaration and, if called upon, I could and would competently testify thereto.

Special Expertise and Experience Was Needed In The Litigation

- 2. I serve as Public Counsel's Senior Special Counsel for Strategic Litigation. Public Counsel is a nonprofit public interest law firm dedicated to advancing civil rights and has extensive experience in complex litigation and immigration matters. Additional information regarding Public Counsel and its professionals may be found on Public Counsel's website, located at publiccounsel.org. I joined Public Counsel after over four decades with the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Southern California, most recently as Chief Counsel. I have argued four times before the United States Supreme Court, more than 25 before the Ninth and Sixth Circuit federal Courts of Appeal, three before the California Supreme Court and before the United States Court of Military Appeals.
- 3. I believe that counsel with specialized expertise unavailable at the inflation-adjusted EAJA rate was essential to the successful prosecution of plaintiffs' motion to enforce the settlement in *Ms. J.P. et al. v. Garland, et al.*
- 4. I have been principal counsel in numerous complex civil rights class action lawsuits. I have litigated many major immigration cases in addition to the *Ms. J.P. et al.* suit: *Orantes-Hernandez suit: e.g., Gregorio T. v. Wilson*, 131 F.3d 1297 (9th Cir. 1997) (striking down Proposition 187; awarded fees at market rates under EAJA); *Perez-Funez v. I.N.S.*, 619 F.Supp. 656 (C.D. Cal. 1985) (rights of children arrested by INS to notification of rights and access to counsel); *Martinez v. Nygaard*, 831 F.2d 822 (9th Cir. 1987) (4th Amendments rights in INS factory raids); *Ramon-*

1

3

4 5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

22

21

23

24

25 26

27

28

- Sepulveda v. I.N.S., 863 F. 2d 1458 (9th Cir. 1988) (due process rights in immigration hearings). Attached hereto as **Exhibit B** is a copy of my resume which describes my qualifications.
- 5. During this litigation, I served as principal counsel and assisted in the development and framing of our theories of the case. I assisted in the identification and selection of plaintiffs, which required considerable knowledge and understanding of the methods and procedures utilized by immigration agents to process detainees. Expertise in this area also served us well in the development of our discovery objectives, and of the specific requests that went out first. It also served us in analyzing and countering arguments by defendants in our opposition to the defendants' motion to dismiss.
- I also relied on my expertise and particularized knowledge of complex 6. civil rights class action lawsuits and immigration law in preparing for and engaging in settlement negotiations that resulted in a successful settlement for plaintiffs.
- 7. I spent 8.8 hours drafting the complaint, 3.4 hours on discovery, 5.4 hours on mediation, 0.5 hours on class certification, 11.9 hours on plaintiffs' opposition to defendants' motion to dismiss, and 63.7 hours on settlement negotiations. In total, I spend <u>93.7 hours</u> on this matter, excluding time spend preparing for and engaging in settlement negotiations related to the present motion for fees.
- 8. I am further familiar with the expertise of my fellow members of the immigration bar, legal services lawyers, and the private bar from which Public Counsel recruits pro bono attorneys. I'm generally familiar with the billing practices of immigration practitioners and general members of the private bar. I do not believe qualified counsel of my level of skill and expertise could have been found to prosecute plaintiffs' claims for less than \$1,170 per hour. I do not believe that qualified counsel of Talia Inlender's skill and expertise could have been found to prosecute plaintiffs' claims for less that \$795 per hour.

Recovery of Other Legal Fees at the EAJA Rate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Over the course of several years, many Public Counsel attorneys, paralegals, and law clerks have dedicated extensive time to this case. Other than my time and the time of Talia Inlender, Plaintiffs seek recovery for all other legal fees at the EAJA statutory rate adjusted for inflation, which is substantially below the market rates for every lawyer who worked on this matter.
- Public Counsel attorneys, paralegals, and volunteers keep time 10. contemporaneously with their tasks on this matter. The records of our time are entered into Public Counsel's database. The record of the time spent, tasks, and activities entered into Public Counsel's database for which Plaintiffs seek recovery is reflected in Exhibit A.
- 11. As itemized and described in Exhibit A, Plaintiffs seek a total of \$233,732.52 in legal fees incurred at the applicable EAJA rate by Public Counsel. Plaintiffs seek an additional \$136,261.50 in legal fees incurred at the market rate based on the specialized knowledge and skill that was essential to the successful prosecution of the present matter. Plaintiffs seek a total of \$369,994.02 in legal fees.
- 12. Based on my experience and expertise in this case, and based on my broader litigation experience, I believe that Public Counsel time for which Plaintiffs seek compensation was necessary and essential to litigating this important and highprofile case as thoroughly and successfully as Plaintiffs' counsel did. I have carefully reviewed the time for which Plaintiffs seek reimbursement and have determined they were necessarily incurred.
- I have met and am familiar with the individual plaintiffs in this lawsuit. 13. They are private individuals whose net worth has never exceeded \$2,000,000.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Filed 02/16/24 Page 6 of 6 Page ID